

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Plumularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa) by the designation of *Sertularia setacea* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species

(Case 2978; see BZN 53: 167–170)

L.B. Holthuis

*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands*

In the application (para. 5) it is noted that the valid type designation for *Plumularia* Lamarck, 1816 is by Busk (1851). There is, however, an earlier designation by H. Milne Edwards in the Disciples edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal*, vol. 20 (1836–1849), pl. 67, fig. 5, where *Plumularia pluma* (Linnaeus, 1758) is the only figured species of that genus. As the title page of the work says 'édition accompagnée de planches gravées représentant les types de tous les genres' this is a valid type designation. Here, the name *Plumularia cristata* Lamarck, 1816 is cited in the synonymy of *P. pluma*, while Lamarck (1816) cited *Sertularia pluma* in his synonymy of *P. cristata*.

H. Milne Edwards's type designation is older than that of Busk (1851) and invalidates the latter. This does not change anything in the proposal made in the application, as the words 'to set aside all previous designations of type species' (para. 12(1)) includes the designations of both H. Milne Edwards (1836–1849) and Busk (1851).

The dates of publication of the plates in Milne Edwards's volume are still very wide (see Cowan, 1976, *Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History*, 8(1): 63–64) but all antedate 1851.

Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells* (1973–1992)

(Case 2964; see BZN 53: 96–98, 273–277)

(1) Emily H. Vokes

*Geology Department, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118–5698,
U.S.A.*

I have read with great dismay the request by Kabat for suppression of Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells*. This is the most frivolous bit of trivia to engage the attention of the Commission in my memory. Kaicher's work was never intended to be for nomenclatural purposes, any more than the dozens of shell picture books that have come onto the market in recent years. If you start having to act on every book that illustrates a supposed holotype or lectotype from some museum collection, you will be very busy indeed. You might start with Abbott & Dance's *Compendium of Seashells* (1982), which illustrates beautifully dozens of holotype or lectotype specimens.

The act of figuring a shell and mentioning it as a lectotype is not, to me, a valid designation of a lectotype. Unless she had stated that 'I here designate specimen no. XXXX as lectotype', she is merely quoting something on a label in a collection.

The very fact, as Kabat himself notes, that this work has never been cited in *Zoological Record* or other abstracting sources, seems to be indicative of the status of the work. There is no 'official disclaimer', but that concept was not in the Code when Kaicher was doing most of her work.

In spite of Kabat's carping about Kaicher's inadequacies, these cards are an extremely valuable tool not only for 'amateurs' but for professionals as well. I personally have found them to be most helpful in my own work, where many of the types of species named by Dall, especially, never previously illustrated were provided. I can do no better than to quote my colleague, R.N. Kilburn, who states: 'Perhaps the most valuable modern contribution to knowledge of the EPITONIIDAE is the illustrated card-index issued by Sally Diana Kaicher (1980, 1981, 1983), which provides excellent photographs of many type specimens, including most of the species described (and inadequately figured) by Jousseume (1985, *Ann. Natal Museum*, v. 27(2), p. 241)'.

I believe the Commission has much better uses to put their time to.

(2) William G. Lyons

Florida Marine Research Institute, 100 Eighth Avenue SE, St Petersburg, Florida 33701-5095, U.S.A.

The proposal by Kabat to suppress Kaicher's card catalogue has been crafted to diminish the work. The tone of the proposal is patronizing, some of its points are misleading, and others are based on unjustified assumptions (including that which indicates that the project has ended; Kaicher is still preparing card-packs, which are available at the usual address, and she is exploring options to correct and update the first 60 packs and reissue them in CD-ROM format). I cannot support this attempt to disparage a valuable contribution to malacology.

Kabat concedes that the catalogue meets the criteria of the Code for publication. He also concedes that inadvertent lectotype designations made in the catalogue are 'potentially valid' (para. 8), indirectly admitting that they were established within specifications of Article 74 of the Code. However, he alludes to ambiguity regarding their availability because the card-packs lack specific indication that they were issued for the purpose of providing a permanent scientific record, a criterion he himself considers subjective. He supports his argument with predictions of confusion and onerous burdens upon 'curators and professional malacologists' if the work is not suppressed. Kabat's case thus rests on Kaicher's intent, which he misrepresents, and upon the impacts of acceptance, which he overstates.

Kabat assumes that 'the purpose of these card-packs was to help amateur shell collectors with ... their personal shell collections' (para. 3; reiterated in the Abstract). That assumption, central to the proposal, is patently incorrect, as Kabat could have verified by contacting Kaicher or others familiar with the work. From the beginning, Kaicher has stated that the series is intended to provide information useful to anyone identifying mollusks, and she has stressed that many cards would be more useful to professionals than to amateurs. Given his misrepresentation of intent, Kabat's remark that Kaicher 'took pride ... that a number of type specimens were included, as that appeared to enhance the value of her card-packs for identification purposes'

(para. 4) seems patronizing. What identification guide would not be enhanced by figures of type specimens, particularly some never before figured photographically and others never before figured at all? Kaicher knows the importance of illustrating types as aids to identification, and she has strived to include such figures for many shells. The contention 'suppression of her work ... would have no effect on their utility for shell collectors *which, after all, was the purpose of her card-packs* [my italics]' (para. 9) is egregious nonsense. Many curators and other malacologists have helped and co-operated with Kaicher's project. Their willingness to search out and photograph types or, more often, to loan types to be photographed, testifies to their regard for the scientific usefulness of the work. It is remarkable that Kabat pretends otherwise.

This catalogue is an important contribution to malacology. Kabat fails to mention that Kaicher has correctly figured and properly identified as holotypes, syntypes, lectotypes, paratypes, etc. the type specimens of hundreds of species, some for the first time and many better than previously done. Kilburn (1985, p. 241) called Kaicher's card catalogue 'perhaps the most valuable modern contribution to knowledge of the EPITONIIDAE ... which provides excellent photographs of many type specimens'. In text references, Kilburn cited the cards for figures of holotypes or syntypes of more than a dozen species-level taxa, and he designated lectotypes for three taxa, specifying them to be specimens figured by Kaicher. In his synonymies, he also cited other cards for figures of types or reclassification actions. Kilburn evidently concurred with Kaicher that figures of types enhanced the value of the card-packs. A quick but incomplete list of others who have found value in the work includes Cernohorsky (1984) and De Jong & Coomans (1988).

The unsubstantiated claim that 'although sets of this work are present in the Mollusk libraries of several natural history museums, none has been formally catalogued' (para. 3) understates the accessibility as well as the importance of this work. Sets of the card catalogue reside in most centers of malacological research in the United States and in the Library of the National Museums of Canada, Ottawa. A brief, partial list of European repositories of the card catalogue includes The Natural History Museum, London; Laboratoire de Biologie des Invertébrés Marins, Paris; Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique, Bruxelles; and Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, Département des Invertébrés, Geneva. Sets of the card catalogue are present in The Australian Museum, Sydney, and in most of the State museums of Australia; sets also reside in museum libraries in Asia (Japan), Africa (South Africa), and South America (Brazil). Kabat does not explain how he determined that none of these sets has been 'formally catalogued', but the issue of book-keeping is minor and should not influence the greater issue of accessibility. Clearly, the work is widely distributed and accessible to professional malacologists.

These are not trading cards for shell collectors. In addition to names and pictures of shells, the cards contain distributional and diagnostic text, often with comparative remarks on similar species. Kaicher has provided original conclusions on classification, reassigned taxa, proposed original synonymies, and refuted some proposed by others, usually supporting her arguments with photographs of type specimens. She has illustrated protoconchs for hundreds of species, many figured from types. Most protoconchs have been figured photographically but many have been drawn, a testament to her skill as an illustrator — she was formerly a biological illustrator at

the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia and later at the Smithsonian Institution where, among other projects, she illustrated gastropods for the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (Knight et al., 1960). The figures of protoconchs are of great value to science but of little interest to most amateurs. Moreover, although some card-packs simply summarize information gathered from scattered sources, others constitute original revisionary work. Especially important are Kaicher's contributions on NASSARIIDAE (packs 31, 34, 41; 1982, 1983, 1985) and OLIVIDAE (packs 33, 49, 51, 54; 1982, 1987, 1988, 1989). The first nassariid pack was acknowledged as monographic by Cernohorsky (1984), and the *Oliva* cards have been cited by several authors. Kaicher's work on *Olivella* constitutes the most comprehensive modern synthesis of the group and represents a considerable improvement over its predecessors (e.g. Olsson, 1956). Lectotype designations, intended or not, are appropriate in such work.

Kabat's statement 'Kaicher does not appear to have researched the literature or status of the supposed type specimens which she illustrated' (para. 5) is another assumption with scant basis in fact. In addition to examining type specimens, Kaicher has consulted original descriptions as well as revisionary works for many of the taxa she treated. In scores of instances, she has identified the repository of the specimen in a manner intended to avoid type designations (e.g. 'BMNH type collection [number]'). In other cases, she uses the word 'type' in quotes (e.g. 'type', USNM) in the meaning of syntype (as has been done in Article 73b(i) of the Code) to signify no more than indication that the specimen bears that label in the collection at that museum; this usage is distinguished from 'the type', which would constitute a lectotype designation (Article 74a). Kabat's examples confirm that Kaicher did not always ascertain the status of supposed types correctly, but to speculate that she did not research the literature or consider the status of types is contrary to fact.

Some of the problems perceived by Kabat are trivial, especially his complaint of typographic errors among listed museum catalogue numbers; such errors can be found in most major works, and this is a major work, treating more than 6000 taxa and providing hundreds, if not thousands, of catalogue numbers. Also inconsequential, and perhaps a bit disingenuous, is Kabat's complaint (para. 7.1) that 'it cannot be determined' which of two lots containing a total of nine specimens included a 'type' specimen of *Nassarius* figured by Kaicher. Most shells, and certainly those of *Nassarius*, are like fingerprints — no two are quite alike. Given the high quality of Kaicher's photographs, including the figure cited by Kabat, a properly motivated person should have little difficulty finding the figured shell. This is not an important issue.

An issue raised by Kabat (para. 7.2) that is important involves designations of ineligible specimens as types; the extent of this problem in Kaicher's work is unknown, but there is no evidence to indicate that cases are common. Nevertheless, a simple remedy for the problem is prescribed — when a designated lectotype is demonstrated to have been based on ineligible material, it loses its status as lectotype (Article 74a(v) of the Code). Errors, when detected, should be pointed out and corrected.

The principal issue here involves Kaicher's inadvertent but 'potentially valid' designation of lectotypes from among eligible syntypes. In most instances these designations arose not from Kaicher's neglect of literature but from the fact that

specimens she figured had already been identified as types and segregated in type collections of some of the world's major museums. Furthermore, she figured and identified these specimens with the co-operation and encouragement of curators at those museums, who seem to have been similarly uninformed of the status of the specimens in their charge. Curators often loaned 'types' to be photographed or provided photographs of specimens and informed her of their 'type' status. In other words, the status of many specimens, correctly or not, had been pre-selected by the curators or their predecessors at those museums, and no one questioned those selections until recently, when the issue was raised in conversations that have led to this proposal. This problem, seldom acknowledged in print, exists at museums on several continents and is sometimes associated with taxa whose material was distributed among several museums (e.g. Kilburn, 1985, pp. 291–292). The 'formalization' in taxonomic papers of such selections, although contrary to recommendations of the Code, is not uncommon and has generally been accepted. Several examples exist where lectotypes for Dall's species have been designated inadvertently by recent workers other than Kaicher (e.g. Abbott & Dance, 1982); are all of these works to be suppressed?

There is nothing ambiguous about the intent of Kaicher's card catalogue, nor of the regard it has been accorded by many curators and other malacologists who have aided the effort and cited the work; all have recognised its value to the permanent scientific record. To suppress Kaicher's inadvertent but legal lectotype designations, review again the literature, re-examine the material and make new designations would create confusion while almost certainly producing identical results in the majority of cases. To suppress this valuable work because it includes some errors of intent (but far fewer errors of fact) would be counterproductive. The work should be allowed to stand and be recognized as a valuable contribution to malacology. Its factual errors can be corrected when detected, and science can move forward.

Additional references

- Cernohorsky, W.O. 1984. Systematics of the family Nassariidae (Mollusca: Gastropoda). *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, **14**: i–iv, 1–356.
- De Jong, K.M. & Coomans, H.E. 1988. *Marine gastropods from Curaçao, Aruba, and Bonaire*. 261 pp. Brill, Leiden.
- Kilburn, R.N. 1985. The family Epitoniidae (Mollusca: Gastropoda) in southern Africa and Mozambique. *Annals of the Natal Museum*, **27**(1): 239–337.
- Knight, J.B., Cox, L.R., Keen, A.M., Batten, R.L., Yochelson, E.L. & Robertson, R. 1960. Systematic descriptions [of Archaeogastropoda]. Pp. 1169–310 in: Moore, R.C. [Ed.], *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part I, Mollusca I*. Geological Society of America and University of Kansas Press, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Olsson, A.A. 1956. Studies on the genus *Olivella*. *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia*, **108**: 155–225.

(3) José H. Leal

The Bailey-Matthews Shell Museum, P.O. Box 1580, Sanibel Island, Florida 33957, U.S.A.

I am writing to request that the Commission does not take the action proposed by Kabat. According to him, Kaicher casually or accidentally selected a few lectotypes from syntype lots deposited in different museums. Unfortunately, these actions are

valid according to the Code. Kaicher's type designations can be clarified and emended by Kaicher herself in future printings or editions of those specific cards or by other researchers working in the distinct molluscan groups involved.

Kaicher's card catalogue has been an extremely useful tool both for collection management and scientific research purposes. Rejecting Kaicher's lifetime work solely for the reasons defended by Kabat is a perfect example of 'throwing away the baby with the bath water'. Due to purely probabilistic reasons, it is inevitable that any compilation of zoological taxa involving figures that reach several thousand species (Kaicher's work already exceeds 6000 cards) will introduce mistakes of some sort. The professional literature on mollusks evidently is no exception to that. I can think of three or four major works published in the last 25 years that show problems of a similar nature, but which were never selected for rejection, probably because they were written by professional malacologists.

I submit that Kaicher's work should not be singled out and rejected for nomenclatural purposes by the Commission. My request is based on the specific reasons cited above and, in a broader sense, seeks to discourage censorship of the kind proposed by Kabat.

(4) A.R. Kabat

*Division of Mollusks, NHB-118, National Museum of Natural History,
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*

I am writing in response to comments on this case published above and in BZN 53: 273-277 (December 1996). The comments in support by various colleagues — Beu, Bouchet, Finet, Kohn and Schiotte — indicate the significant doubt existing among professional malacologists regarding Kaicher's card-packs. Furthermore, Kohn has emphasized the additional problem of Kaicher having used unpublished manuscript species names in her card-packs, and that Kaicher specifically assured him that she had no intent of publishing new names or that her card-packs be taken as part of the scientific record.

The criticisms written by several other colleagues have missed the fundamental point of my proposal, i.e. that Kaicher's work would be suppressed solely for nomenclatural purposes. This will have no effect whatsoever on its significant value for identification and curatorial purposes, and the excellent photographs in this work can and will continue to be cited by malacologists in their systematic publications. Suppression of this work for nomenclatural purposes is not a value judgment, nor does it represent 'censorship' (contrary to Leal's assertion) since these card-packs will remain readily available to all and can be referenced for their high-quality illustrations.

An analogous example would be the first 11 volumes of the first edition of Martini & Chemnitz, *Neue Systematisches Conchylien-Cabinet* (1769-1795), suppressed for nomenclatural purposes in 1954; despite its suppression, this work remains widely cited and used precisely because of its fine illustrations of shells. Its suppression for nomenclatural purposes has had no effect on the value of this work to systematists and bibliophiles. Similarly, suppression of Kaicher's card-packs for nomenclatural purposes means that her cards will still be an extremely useful tool for collection management and scientific research purposes — precisely the original rationale for these cards.

Several of the criticisms warrant a response on my part:

(1) Lyons remarks that Kaicher will 'correct and update' these card-packs, and Leal remarks that her type designations 'can be clarified and emended by Kaicher herself'. However, any disclaimer of her intent cannot be made retrospectively, and her designations of lectotypes, if they are taken to be valid, remain unless or until the Commission rules that the work is suppressed for nomenclatural purposes or that such designations are deemed not to be valid. It is good to know that Kaicher's work will be resumed, and I look forward to the reprinting of the card-packs, or reissue in a CD-ROM version; alternatively republication on the Internet (World Wide Web) would also ensure the wide distribution of Kaicher's photographs.

(2) Vokes states that 'the act of figuring a shell and calling it a lectotype is not, to me, a valid designation of a lectotype'. If this were correct, then one of the problems raised by Kaicher's card-packs would disappear. However, Article 74 of the Code provides that use of the term lectotype or an equivalent expression (e.g. 'the type') or a statement or inference 'that one original specimen is the holotype or the type' represents a valid lectotype designation.

(3) Lyons questions my remark that the card-packs have not been formally catalogued by libraries. I should clarify and expand upon my earlier statement to emphasize that I was specifically referring to the practice of North American research libraries not only to assign call numbers to catalogued publications, but also to make these library records available online (through 'OCLC') for the purposes of Inter-Library Loan. At the time I wrote my proposal, there were no such online records in OCLC of Kaicher's card-packs, as confirmed by the Smithsonian Institution Libraries office in charge of Inter-Library Loans. This means that North American researchers or shell collectors whose local library did not have Kaicher's card-packs would have been unable to borrow this work or obtain photocopies of it through normal library loan procedures. Harasewych & Petit state that Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* 'has been catalogued by the Smithsonian Libraries', but this was not done until 29 August 1996, two months after publication of my proposal and presumably in response to my noting its absence in such library catalogues. It is good to know that Kaicher's card-packs are finally available to researchers at other North American libraries through Inter-Library Loan procedures.

(4) Harasewych & Petit remark, as does Leal, that certain other publications on mollusks also contain similar type designations; however, most of these publications differ in that they are expressly part of the scientific record for nomenclatural purposes (all but one cited by Harasewych & Petit contain new species-level taxa, and some also have new genus-level taxa), and they have usually been recognized by malacologists for their lectotype designations. In contrast, I am unaware of any printed publication (as of November 1996) which cites a Kaicher lectotype designation; indeed, in my 1994 correspondence with several professional malacologists while preparing this proposal, none even knew that her card-packs had potential lectotype designations.

(5) Harasewych & Petit discuss a possible source of some of these problems, i.e. the 1942 curatorial activities at the Smithsonian Institution necessitated by the need to move type specimens away from the museum during World War II. This information, while historically interesting, has no bearing on the validity of Kaicher's actions. Harasewych & Petit refer to the actions taken at that time as 'constituting the

actual selections of 'lectotypes' for the species in question, although not formalized by a published statement of such action', but these curatorial activities are not nomenclatural acts. Harasewych & Petit also claim that the then-curators were able to select 'illustrated specimens or specimens best conforming to the published descriptions' for removal to safe storage. Harasewych & Petit do not mention that Drs Morrison and Rehder had only a few months to select and remove 14,663 lots (over one hundred lots per day) from the world's largest mollusk collection. It is difficult to believe that, given these time constraints, the original descriptions (let alone illustrations, dimensions and type localities) could have been checked for so many species described in over 500 publications. Indeed, while researching certain types from the *Blake* and *Albatross* expeditions, I found various lots in the Smithsonian mollusk type collection which they had segregated, labeled and catalogued as 'holotypes', but which in fact were not types as they were not from the type locality; instead, syntypes in the general collection represented actual type material.

In conclusion, the various criticisms of the proposal to suppress Kaicher's card-packs for nomenclatural purposes bring up irrelevant issues, misinterpret the provisions of the Code regarding lectotype designations, and overlook the fundamental fact (as pointed out in my original application) that suppression will have no effect whatsoever on the value of Kaicher's card-packs to both malacologists and shell collectors. This work will remain widely used and cited precisely because of its excellent illustrations and will remain an important contribution to this field. Suppression will merely eliminate the problems raised by Kaicher's wholly inadvertent lectotype selections, as well as those raised by her publication of manuscript species names, and will conform to her intent that these card-packs are not part of the scientific record for nomenclatural purposes.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Arca pectunculoides* Scacchi, 1834 and *A. philippiana* Nyst, 1848 (currently *Bathyarca pectunculoides* and *B. philippiana*; Mollusca, Bivalvia)
(Case 2977; see BZN 53: 173–177)

Anders Warén

Swedish Museum of Natural History, P.O. Box 50007, S-10405 Stockholm, Sweden

This case is an excellent example of when an older name should be rejected.

1. Misidentification of the original description and type material has led to incorrect use of the specific name of *Arca grenophia* Risso, 1826 for *Bathyarca pectunculoides* (Scacchi, 1834), a well known species (para. 5 of the application).

2. As an older synonym of *Bathyarca philippiana* (Nyst, 1844), the name *grenophia* is a threat against this quite well known name (para. 6).

3. A strict application of priority would switch the use of the name *grenophia* to *Bathyarca philippiana*. Much confusion would result since without a lengthy explanation it would be ambiguous which of the two species (*pectunculoides* or *philippiana*) was referred to.

4. A swift rejection of *grenophia* will mean that all modern use of the name will relate to the one taxon, *B. pectunculoides*.